

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	10/804,472 03/18/2004		03/18/2004	Michael W. Diesch		040143-000200	7248
	20350	7590	10/04/2006		. Г	EXAMINER	
	TOWNSEN	TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			KINDRED, ALFORD W		
	TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER				_	·	
	EIGHTH FLO	OOR		•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	SAN EDANO	SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3834			_	21/2	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/804,472	DIESCH ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alford W. Kindred	2163	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	<u> </u>		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed  m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 M     2a)□ This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This     3)□ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p		
Disposition of Claims			
4)	wn from consideration.  r election requirement.  er.  epted or b)□ objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been recei u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ntion No ved in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/29/05	4) Interview Summal Paper No(s)/Mail   5) Notice of Informal   0ther:	Date	

## **Detailed Action**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 03/18/04.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fries, US# 20030036922.

As per claim 1, Fries teaches "receiving property record data for a plurality of parcels into a computer system, wherein the property record data relates to source property record documents; storing the property record data in a searchable database; receiving into the computer system an identifier; in the computer system, using the identifier to search the database and select from the property record documents a set of relevant documents relating to the parcel; in the computer system, using the set of relevant documents to produce a data summary" (see paragraph [0009] and [0027]) "outputting the data summary from the computer system; wherein the data summary comprises information from which an underwriter can underwrite a title policy, using commonly-accepted title policy underwriting rules, without reference to the source documents, or images thereof, from which the data summary originated" (see paragraph [0029]-[0030]).

Art Unit: 2163

As per claim 2, Fries teaches "wherein the title policy comprises a selection from the group consisting of: American Land Title Association (ALTA) Loan Policy; ALTA Owner's Policy; ALTA Short Form Residential Loan Policy; Homeowner's Policy of Title Insurance for a One-to-Four Family Residence . . ." (see paragraph [0042]).

As per claim 3, 8, and 28, Fries teaches "wherein the data summary comprises a display screen on a computer monitor" (see paragraph [0041] and [0044]).

As per claim 4, Fries teach "a printed document" (see paragraph [0027]).

As per claims 5-6, Fries teaches, "wherein the printed document comprises a title abstract" (see paragraph [0040]).

As per claims 7, Fries teaches "wherein the printed document comprises a policy" (see paragraph [0005]).

As per claim 9, Fries teaches "wherein the document comprises a selection from the group consisting of: policy, deed, mortgage, commitment, closing-related document, template, and form" (see paragraph [0027] and [0029]).

As per claim 10, Fries teaches "creating at least one index relating to the property record data; and using the at least one index together with the identifier to select relevant documents" (see paragraph [0027] and [0031]).

As per claims 11-13, Fries teaches "in the computer system, using the identifier to search the database and select from the property record documents a set of potentially relevant documents relating to the parcel; and in the computer system, applying logic to organize the documents" (see paragraph [0009], [0034], and [0038]).

As per claim 14, Fries teaches "relating one or more documents to one or more

Art Unit: 2163

other documents to identify any unreleased liens" (see paragraph [0011] and [0024]).

As per claims 15-16, Fries teaches "wherein applying logic to organize the documents comprises: relating one or more documents to one or more other documents to identify a good stop in a chain of title" (see paragraph [0030]).

As per claim 17, Fries teaches "wherein the property record data is received into the computer system before the relevant document set is selected" (see paragraph [0032] and [0038]).

As per claim 18, Fries teaches "wherein the identifier comprises a selection from the group consisting of grantor name, legal description of the parcel, physical address of the parcel . . " (see paragraph [0009] and [0037]).

As per claims 19 and 29, Fries teaches "receiving a plurality of images representing property records; converting the images to electronic image data; paginating the electronic image data into related groups representing individual documents . . . manual processes to convert information in the data fields into electronic information; and organizing the electronic information into data records" (see paragraph [0043]-[0044]).

As per claims 20 and 23, Fries teaches "wherein the data summary comprises a listing of the relevant documents" (see paragraph [0027]).

As per claims 21-24, Fries teaches "wherein the listing of the relevant documents includes a score for at least one of the documents that indicates the degree of relevance of the document" (see paragraph [0037]-[0038]).

As per claims 25-28 these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the

Art Unit: 2163

arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and 8 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 30-33, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1, and 22-23 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 34-41, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 8-9 and 17 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 42-49, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 2-9 and 23-24 and are similarly rejected.

Page 5

Art Unit: 2163

## Conclusion

Page 6

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alford W. Kindred whose telephone number is 571-272-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:00 am- 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alford W. Kindred Patent Examiner

Tech Ctr. 2100